

1 TERRY T. JOHNSON, State Bar No. 121569 (tjohnson@wsgr.com)  
2 BORIS FELDMAN, State Bar No. 128838 (boris.feldman@wsgr.com)  
3 BAHRAM SEYEDIN-NOOR, State Bar No. 203224 (bnoor@wsgr.com)  
4 CHERYL W. FOUNG, State Bar No. 108868 (cfoung@wsgr.com)  
5 BRYAN KETROSER, State Bar No 239105 (bketroser@wsgr.com)  
6 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
7 650 Page Mill Road  
8 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050  
9 Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
10 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

11 Attorneys for Defendants

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 PETER RUDOLPH, individually and on behalf ) CASE NO.: C-07-4578 SI  
12 of all others similarly situated, )  
13 Plaintiff, ) JOINT STIPULATION AND  
14 v. ) [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING  
15 UT STARCOM, HONG LIANG LU, MICHAEL ) TIME FOR DEFENDANTS'  
16 SOPHIE, THOMAS TOY, and FRANCIS ) RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S CLASS  
17 BARTON, ) ACTION COMPLAINT  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

1           WHEREAS, on September 4, 2007, Plaintiff filed his Class Action Complaint for  
2 Violations of the Federal Securities Law (“Class Action Complaint”);

3           WHEREAS, on September 20, 2007, lead plaintiffs in the action entitled *In re*  
4 *UTStarcom, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. C-04-4908 (N.D. Cal.) (“*In re UTStarcom*”), filed an  
5 Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related Pursuant to Civil Local  
6 Rules 3-12 and 7-11 (“Motion to Relate Cases”), requesting that that court relate the instant  
7 action to *In re UTStarcom*;

8           WHEREAS Plaintiff in this action timely filed a memorandum of points and authorities  
9 opposing this Administrative Motion to Relate Cases on September 25, 2007;

10          WHEREAS, the court in *In re UTStarcom* has not yet ruled on the Motion to Relate  
11 Cases;

12          WHEREAS, counsel for plaintiff and defendants have met and conferred and have agreed  
13 to a schedule for briefing any motions directed at the Class Action Complaint but desire to avoid  
14 unnecessary motion practice until it is determined whether the present action will be  
15 consolidated with *In re UTStarcom*;

16          WHEREAS, the parties therefore stipulate that: a) defendants’ time to Answer or  
17 otherwise respond will be extended until forty-five (45) after Court-appointed lead plaintiff(s) in  
18 this action files an Amended Complaint in the instant action, b) if and when defendants serve any  
19 motion(s) directed at the court-appointed lead plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, the lead plaintiff’s  
20 opposition brief(s) will be due within forty-five (45) days of the filing of such motion, and that  
21 defendants’ reply brief(s) will be due within thirty (30) days of any opposition;

22          NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the parties’ stipulation and subject to the Court’s  
23 approval:

24           (a)     Defendants’ time to Answer or otherwise respond will be extended until forty-five  
25 (45) after Court-appointed lead plaintiff(s) in this action files an Amended Complaint in the  
26 instant action;

27           (b)     if and when defendants serve any motion(s) directed at the court-appointed lead  
28 plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, the lead plaintiff’s opposition brief(s) will be due within forty-

1 five (45) days of the filing of such motion, and that defendants' reply brief(s) will be due within  
2 thirty (30) days of any opposition;

3 (c) If defendants file and serve a reply to plaintiff's opposition, they must do so  
4 within thirty (30) days of the opposition; and

5 (d) Should the court in *In re UTStarcom* grant the Motion to Relate Cases, defendants  
6 shall not be required to respond to plaintiff's Class Action Complaint, but will comply with the  
7 existing deadlines already in place in *In re UTStarcom*.

8 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

9  
10 Dated: October 4, 2007

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation

11  
12  
13 By: /s/ BAHRAM SEYEDIN-NOOR  
14 BAHRAM SEYEDIN-NOOR

15 Attorneys for Defendants

16 Dated: October 4, 2007

17 FINKELSTEIN, THOMPSON LLP

18  
19 By: /s/ DONALD J. ENRIGHT  
20 DONALD J. ENRIGHT

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff

22 **ORDER**

23 PURSUANT TO THIS STIPULATION, AND GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, IT IS SO  
24 ORDERED.

25  
26  
27 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

28 The Honorable Susan Illston  
United States District Court Judge

1 I, Bryan Ketroser, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to  
2 file the Joint Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Time for Defendants' Response to  
3 Plaintiff's Class Action Complaint. I hereby attest that Bahram Seyedin-Noor and Donald J.  
4 Enright have concurred in this filing.

5  
6 Dated: October 4, 2007

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
7 Professional Corporation

8 By: /s/ BRYAN KETROSER  
9 BRYAN KETROSER

10 Attorneys for Defendants

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28